United Nations A/51/PV.67

General Assembly

Fifty-first Session

Official Records

67th plenary meeting
Wednesday, 27 November 1996, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Razali Ismail ..... (Malaysia)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 42

Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity

Report of the Secretary-General (A/51/386)

Draft resolution (A/51/L.19)

The President: I call on the representative of Cameroon to introduce draft resolution A/51/L.19.

Mr. Mpay (Cameroon): It is my honour, in my capacity as the Chairman of the African Group, to comment on the progress of cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which has over the years been very useful in the promotion of development in Africa.

Over the past 35 years, African countries had dramatic experiences with development. A number of countries have made some progress in the area of economic growth and development, but others have yet to find solutions to the critical problems facing their development efforts. In all of these countries, cooperation arrangements between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in various aspects of development have provided a major impetus. Cooperation between the two organizations has, by and large, covered consultations, the exchange of information, and the promotion of economic and social development.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of the OAU have consulted on several issues affecting the development of Africa. The cooperation between the United Nations Development Programme and the OAU has concentrated on strengthening the managerial and administrative capacities of the OAU and on providing support for the African Economic Community. The United Nations Environment Programme has provided financial and technical support for the organization of an African expert group meeting to prepare an African consensus and common perspective and position regarding the application of the Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa.

The United Nations Population Fund has just completed a four-year project with the OAU to strengthen the technical capacity of the organization in areas relating to population and development, with a view to assisting member States in adopting and implementing population policies. The relationship between the OAU and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has been further consolidated by joint efforts to address the consequences of forced population displacement in the Great Lakes region within the framework of a Plan of Action adopted at Bujumbura in 1995.

At the programme level, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) is collaborating with the OAU on the development of a

96-86907 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Common African Agricultural Programme. FAO is working with the OAU on the preparation of the nineteenth FAO Regional Conference information document on the Programme. We welcome the efforts of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the reinforcement of its cooperation with the OAU in the implementation of the United Nations System-wide Special Initiative on Africa. In the framework of institutional capacity-building in Africa, UNESCO has offered to contribute to strengthening the OAU secretariat.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) has provided financial resources under its different facilities, especially under the Structural Adjustment Facility and the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, to African countries in support of their structural adjustment programmes. The IMF has also engaged in the mobilization of additional resources for African countries, in the context of multilateral conferences on aid coordination and the rescheduling of debt by the Paris Club. Furthermore, we welcome a project concerning cooperation with the OAU by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in the context of the African Economic Community and the Cairo Agenda for Action. The project will assist the OAU in the elaboration of a protocol for an appropriate strategy to promote regional cooperation and integration, with particular reference to the development of the private sector and to the preparation of selected high-impact regional programmes.

The fact that most of the countries on the continent continue to experience poor economic growth and development — with resulting poverty aggravation, high rates of unemployment, high rates of inflation, decreasing production and environmental degradation — makes increasing commitment to and intensification of cooperation more urgent than ever. In particular, cooperation is urgently needed in the few countries experiencing political stresses and strains. The OAU will welcome increasing support for its Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution. In particular, there is a need for more support for the development of its preventive diplomacy capacity. In this connection, we continue to urge the support of the United Nations for OAU efforts to manage peaceful democratic transition in Africa.

In addition, our organization will continue to count on the support of the United Nations in coping with emergency situations created by acts of war. In particular, we are counting on the United Nations cooperation with the OAU to end hostilities, support rehabilitation efforts and provide assistance in dealing with issues of refugees and displaced persons.

I should like to underscore once again the importance of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s (UN-NADAF) to Africa's development. The recently concluded mid-term review of UN-NADAF offers the international community another opportunity to find durable solutions to development problems in Africa. The review has made it abundantly clear that, while African countries themselves will need to continue with their political and economic reforms, these efforts will need to be more effectively complemented by the international community if the gains in economic growth and development that some countries have made are to be incremental and sustained.

We feel that, in the context of this review, it is obvious that the United Nations must adequately fund all its agencies and organs concerned with the implementation of UN-NADAF as we march on in the second half of the Programme.

External debt is a serious issue in African development. Each Integrated Programme for Commodities is welcome, but it is clear that this may not necessarily provide an adequate and final solution to this problem, given the inherent limitations. We therefore continue to urge the international community to continue to search for better arrangements which take into consideration the interest of debtors and creditors, but with ample provisions for unloading the debt burden.

African countries have come a long way in the liberalization of their investment codes. There is increasing need for foreign direct investment, while attempts are being made to consolidate the political and socio-economic environment. In an increasingly globalized world economy, the international community should also continue to assist African countries in their efforts to be more competitive, remove the impediments to their exports and help in their efforts to promote export diversification.

In reiterating, I would like to restate that the need for foreign aid will remain critical for many countries. This will be vital for many weak countries in terms of capacity-building and the development of social and economic infrastructures. There should be a serious commitment on the part of the international community to meeting the needs of these countries.

I would like to say in conclusion that the OAU continues to count on the increasing support and cooperation of the United Nations as we are about to cross into the next century. We believe that more meaningful cooperation will continue to emerge, given the assumption that the full development of all continents and countries worldwide would be to the advantage of all, especially in terms of higher prosperity in under-developed countries.

I would like to add that the draft resolution introduced in connection with this question is still being negotiated, so we will ask for the postponement of action on this draft resolution.

Mr. Campbell (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The following associated countries have aligned themselves with this statement: Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and the Slovak Republic. Iceland has also aligned itself with this statement.

The European Union welcomes the comprehensive and informative report of the Secretary-General on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) (A/51/386). The European Union believes that international regional organizations have an increasingly important role to play in the world today. They allow groupings of countries in proximity to each other to assess and seek to meet the various challenges, whether in the economic, social, ecological or security fields, which confront any one region. It can be said that the approach to any problem by a regional organization can be particularly effective by virtue of the organization being geographically closer to the problem and its membership individually affected by it.

Geographical proximity links Europe closely with Africa and developments there affect Europe perhaps more than they affect any other continent. We are also bound historically by special relationships and ties which we believe impose upon us particular responsibilities towards our southern neighbours. The European Union wishes further to cultivate and promote these ties and to intensify relationships with Africa in many fields. Regional organizations in Africa, such as the Organization of African Unity and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) are ideal partners for dialogue and cooperation to this end. We also note the important role played by the Economic Community of West African States in West Africa (ECOWAS) and, in particular, its Monitoring Group (ECOMOG)'s efforts to maintain peace and security in Liberia. In East Africa, we would draw attention to the initiatives being undertaken by the Commission for East African Cooperation.

For this reason the European Union welcomes regular contact and dialogue with the regional organizations in Africa. Most recently, in mid-October, the second SADC-European Union ministerial conference took place in Windhoek, Namibia. This conference afforded an opportunity to review political developments in our respective regions to assess how far our mutual cooperation has progressed and to define more accurately what our future plans should be. The European Union also attaches the greatest importance to the continuing dialogue with the OAU. We look forward to a ministerial-level meeting with this organization early next year. Meetings have already gone ahead between the European Union and the OAU at the level of senior officials.

In previous meetings, the OAU has explained to us in some detail its ideas on conflict prevention management and resolution in Africa. We welcome the mechanism which the organization has set up for this purpose and we are confident that it will be of particular value in helping to resolve conflicts and tension. We also welcome the possibility it affords to allow African States to take the lead in such matters on their own continent, which we consider essential. The European Union is pursuing the dialogue with the OAU in this important area and is supporting — both technically and financially — the organization's efforts to set an appropriate mechanism in place.

The European Union recognizes the preeminent role of the United Nations in peacekeeping matters and recalls in particular the proposals put forward by the Secretary-General in his "An Agenda for Peace". The European Union is convinced of the need for the closest possible cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU. We note that Article 52 of the United Nations Charter recognizes the particular role to be played by regional organizations in this regard.

As we look at the continent of Africa today, there is reason to be hopeful for the future. Democracy is taking root in an increasing number of States and there is a healthy debate within individual countries on how best to make this democracy more directly relevant to the people themselves how to encourage people to participate more fully in government and how to enable them more directly to influence the shaping of their own future. The OAU has an influential role — and indeed a

responsibility — to foster and support such debate. The international community and, in particular, the United Nations have, in turn, a responsibility to assist the OAU in this task. The European Union therefore encourages the further intensification of dialogue and cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU in these matters.

While we congratulate Africa on the substantial progress it has made in its efforts to introduce more widespread democracy and to deal with problems within its frontiers, the European Union shares the grave concerns of Africans themselves with events in a number of parts of their continent and with undemocratic trends witnessed in some countries.

The European Union considers it a duty to speak out against injustice and in support of the resolution of conflict. Thus there are occasions when we find it necessary to make public — whether here in the United Nations or in other forums — our concern about events in certain countries in Africa and elsewhere. In the past year, we have expressed concern about the situation in Burundi, Liberia, Somalia and Western Sahara. One year after the execution of Ken Saro Wiwa and eight others in Nigeria, we remain gravely concerned by the human rights situation and the slow pace of transition to democratic rule in that country. In Angola, we must express our anxiety at the slow rate of progress in the implementation of the peace process.

Today, however, foremost in all our minds is the rapidly evolving and potentially catastrophic situation in the Great Lakes region. Accurate and up-to-date information on precisely what is happening has been difficult to obtain. Recently, there appears to have been a significant improvement in the situation, and the threat of the appalling humanitarian tragedy that we all feared a couple of weeks ago appears to have substantially receded. We remain gravely concerned, however, that there are still considerable humanitarian problems to be tackled on the ground, and we must not underestimate the range of complex and difficult tasks that confront the international relief agencies. There is still an urgent need for humanitarian assistance and help with repatriation. We must ensure that any assistance that is given is appropriate, sufficient, effective and delivered in time. To this end we must monitor the situation very closely on a continuing basis. We should also strive to ensure that the response of the international community to this crisis is both coherent and well-coordinated.

For its part, on 7 November the European Union convened a special meeting of its development and humanitarian aid ministers to review the situation, following which the European Union troika of ministers travelled to the region. In recent days the European Commission has announced an emergency aid package totalling approximately $7 million for Rwanda, Zaire, Burundi, Tanzania and Uganda, bringing to almost $700 million the total of our humanitarian aid to the Great Lakes region since 1993.

While the immediate need is for humanitarian assistance, we must not overlook the broader political problems underlying the present crisis and the threat that they pose to the future peace and stability of the entire Great Lakes region. These problems can be resolved only through early and substantive dialogue. In this context the European Union reiterates its support for the convening of an international conference on peace, security and development in the region under the joint auspices of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in order to address, within a global approach, the root causes of the crisis and to ensure respect for commitments. The European Union, through its Special Envoy, Mr. Aldo Ajello, and in close coordination with the Secretary-General's Special Envoy, Ambassador Chrétien, as well as former President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, will continue to seek to facilitate a peaceful resolution to the conflicts. We are ready to address the humanitarian requirements and to contribute to the peacekeeping force that has been authorized by the Security Council.

The European Union is deeply conscious of the enormous challenge of economic development that continues to confront the continent of Africa. Many countries in Africa are undertaking extensive reforms in their economic policies and their public sector institutions, which have begun to revive growth, and they have achieved significant and laudable progress in essential sectors such as health, education and the provision of basic services. At the same time, the fact remains that half of the population of sub-Saharan Africa lives below the poverty line. Such poverty is a reminder of the economic and social progress that has yet to be achieved. We believe that to reduce poverty, African countries must, with the encouragement and support of the international community, achieve and maintain a steady rate of growth in per capita income. Development programmes should also aim to ensure that the poorest sections of the populations benefit most.

The European Union will continue to play a determined part in achieving these goals. The framework for our assistance is already in place, with the Lomé Convention serving as the cornerstone of our efforts. The aid extended by the European Union under the Lomé Convention, together with the assistance it offers through other channels, makes the European Union today the largest aid donor in the world. We confirm our commitment to continue to assist the developing countries in Africa and to reinforce our cooperation with them in securing their future well-being and prosperity.

While the European Union offers its assistance freely, it recognizes that it has a responsibility to do so. On the African side also, responsibilities must be accepted if development is to be sustained and prosperity assured. Above all, there is the responsibility of each Government to its own people to secure basic rights and freedoms, thereby creating the fertile climate in which economies can grow. There are also the mutual responsibilities of States to each other and their shared environment. These responsibilities go beyond the requirement of respecting each other's sovereignty. The Organization of African Unity has assumed an important role in defining these responsibilities, in exploring ways of ensuring their observance and in helping to shape a common vision of the future of the continent of Africa. The European Union is convinced that the Organization of African Unity, with the assistance and cooperation of the international community, and in particular the United Nations, will meet the challenge of helping Africa steer a course of confidence and hope into the next millennium.

Mr. Whannou (Benin) *(interpretation from French)*: Since 1988, resolutions have been regularly adopted by this Assembly recognizing the need for cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Aware of the central role the United Nations has played in the international arena since the end of the cold war, the Heads of State or Government of the OAU, at a meeting that took place from 8 to 10 July 1996 at Yaoundé, Cameroon, reaffirmed their belief in this cooperation, fully convinced that the United Nations now has new possibilities for attaining its fundamental purposes: the maintenance of international peace and security, the attainment of a minimum common level of social conditions, and the promotion of and respect for human rights.

Given this vision, on 24 October 1996, President Paul Biya of Cameroon, who is the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, showed the international community the developing picture of the political, economic and social situation in the African continent, calling upon the United Nations system to maintain and intensify its cooperation with Africa.

Hotbeds of tension exist in many places in Africa. Evidence of that is the human tragedy now being played out before the eyes of the international community in the Great Lakes region, particularly in eastern Zaire. We must be especially worried about this because it threatens completely to engulf the area, in which massive population shifts are taking place and where there has been enormous loss of human life, creating persistent tensions in the good-neighbourly relations between the countries in the region. The protagonists must exercise restraint and embrace dialogue so as to ensure peace, security and understanding among the peoples and States involved.

Because of the gravity of this situation, on 11 November 1996, in Addis Ababa, at the initiative of the Algerian Government and under the chairmanship of Cameroon, we held, at ministerial level, the fourth special session of the OAU Central Organ's Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution.

An appeal was then launched to the international community and the Security Council for emergency action to prevent armed conflicts that could only undo all the development efforts.

My country thanks Canada for its spontaneous involvement in dealing with this tragedy and the humanitarian organizations for their generosity. But we would also like to express our indignation at the clash of views that has developed in the past few days over the mandate of the multinational force, which is the subject of Security Council resolution 1080 (1996), the timing of its dispatch and its composition. Meanwhile, the lack of assistance is costing or threatening thousands of human lives. Is there no limit to the rhetoric? One must agree with my delegation that, without peace and security, Africa will not be able to meet the challenge of the third millennium.

It is regrettable in every instance that action often does not follow the wish to cooperate. It is in order to fill that void that we are considering draft resolution A/51/L.19, which so eloquently addresses the need to strengthen cooperation and action between the United Nations and the OAU.

One area in which cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU is particularly urgent and necessary is cooperation aimed towards the economic recovery and development of Africa. The General Assembly has often emphasized the urgent need to strengthen international cooperation with a view to finding a lasting solution, *inter alia*, to the foreign debt problems of developing countries, particularly those in Africa. Debt-servicing in Africa has now reached alarming proportions. It is one of the main hindrances to the economic and social development of our continent. Faced with increasingly difficult situations regarding resources, the majority of African countries have entered into structural adjustment programmes, but these programmes will not be sufficient over the long term.

In order to remedy the imbalance, Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali, worthy son of Africa, launched the United Nations System-wide Special Initiative for Africa on 15 March 1996. We speak from this forum to awaken the developed countries and the multilateral financial institutions to the need to support the Initiative as well as the outcome of the mid-term review of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s, held from 16 to 20 September 1996. The international community must now implement that outcome with a view towards the harmonious development of our interdependent world.

We must recall that one of the major concerns of the Heads of State and Government of Africa is to strengthen cooperation between the OAU and the United Nations within the framework of the establishment of the African Economic Community. They would invite international organizations, financial institutions and other bodies within the United Nations system, as well as non-governmental organizations, to support programmes for economic integration and cooperation within the context of priorities set by subregional economic communities.

African integration remains a necessity for the survival of African States in an international arena increasingly marked by regional groupings emerging from the globalization of the challenges to be met. The delegation of Benin cannot overemphasize the need, reflected in the draft resolution, to ensure the effective, fair and equitable representation of Africa at the various levels and echelons of the United Nations system.

In conclusion, I would like to express the hope that all the delegations of our Assembly will come together to adopt by consensus draft resolution A/51/L.19, which expresses the aspirations of the people of Africa and reflects the collective political wishes of their leaders.

Mr. Abdellah (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) has increased in importance in recent years and has proven to be very useful for attaining the common goals of the two organizations.

This has been particularly manifest in the area of conflict prevention and peacekeeping. Since the establishment of the OAU Central Organ of the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, cooperation between the two organizations has continuously grown and strengthened, thanks to the key role played by the Central Organ in Africa and the growing interest now being given by the United Nations to the contribution of regional organizations and arrangements to the maintenance of peace. It is worth stressing here that the joint action of the two organizations would be even more effective if the OAU Organ had the proper resources to do its job.

Last year, the United Nations Secretary-General submitted a report on improving the capacity for conflict prevention and the maintenance of peace in Africa. The recommendations in his report reflect a real desire to further cooperation between the two organizations.

Proposals to promote the system of stand-by arrangements within a context of partnership deserve further exploration with a view to facilitating the participation of African countries in peacekeeping operations. Here, the United Nations could make a valuable contribution, *inter alia*, through the training of personnel that serve in this system.

The support of the United Nations is also very useful in strengthening African capacities in conflict prevention. This is a priority to which the Central Organ of the OAU gives special attention. The fragility of the security situation in several areas of the continent makes preventive action the main focal point of African efforts in the maintenance of peace. The OAU is striving to promote a system of prevention based on information that should make it possible better to follow developing situations showing signs of crisis.

We wish to stress here the fact that conflict prevention should not be confined to security aspects alone; they should also encompass development aspects.

It is essential that cooperation between the two organizations be based on prevention in all its dimensions.

Furthermore, and still within the same context of prevention, the countries whose institutions and infrastructures have been devastated by long-standing domestic warfare now need increased assistance from the international community to help them rebuild their economies and improve the living conditions of their peoples, because without ongoing economic and social development, internal tensions will always continue to threaten the stability of these countries.

On another level, the problem of refugees and displaced persons, which is a permanent source of tension and instability, must be given the attention and concern it deserves. In this connection, my delegation welcomes the efforts being made by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, in cooperation with the OAU, to assist refugees and to find solutions to their unfortunate situation.

Here, we stress the need to convene a regional conference under the auspices of the United Nations and the OAU to examine all the problems of the Great Lakes region and to adopt a comprehensive approach to their solution.

Cooperation between the two organizations is also essential in the sphere of development, at a time when Africa is being confronted by various problems that are impeding the attainment of sustained economic growth.

Since 1991, official development assistance for Africa has been shrinking, and direct foreign investments remain weak in a very difficult international context that is marked by a fierce commercial competition that the Uruguay agreements have made even more onerous for the African countries. Furthermore, the debt burden continues to weigh heavily on the economies of those countries and to hinder their development policies.

In this connection, I am pleased to welcome the interest that the international community has recently shown in the course of the work of the General Assembly's Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole for the Mid-Term Review of the Implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s (UN-NADAF). It is worth recalling that this New Agenda, which was adopted by resolution 46/151 of 18 December 1991, has among its priorities

> "the accelerated transformation, integration, diversification and growth of the African economies, in order to strengthen them within the world economy, reduce their vulnerability to external shocks and increase their dynamism, internalize the process of development and enhance self-reliance". (*resolution 46/151, annex, part II, para. 6*)

We stress here that the international community's commitments to achieving those objectives should be understood as meaning that African development is primarily the responsibility of the African countries themselves and that the support of the international community should be to bolster the efforts of those countries. The latter have in recent years undertaken to introduce major reforms in economic management that are now beginning to bear fruit. We believe that those efforts deserve encouragement, in particular through the mobilization of resources, debt relief, economic diversification and a speeding up of the process of implementation by the African Economic Community.

In this connection, I cannot fail to welcome the Secretary-General's initiative for African development, which is a valuable tool for the implementation of UN-NADAF. The international community must mobilize to guarantee the success of that initiative.

I should also like to reiterate the proposal made by President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, President of the Republic of Tunisia, advocating the concept of a global economic and social plan aimed at guaranteeing African growth on sound and lasting bases and at assisting our continent to remedy its deficiencies, achieve integration into the world economy and ensure dignified living conditions for all peoples in Africa.That plan seeks to strengthen African capabilities by mobilizing financial resources, increasing technical assistance and consolidating industrialization through partnerships, direct investment and trade and by finding a solution to the debt problem. We believe that cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity would be of great value in this area.

In conclusion, I should like to pay a tribute to the Secretaries-General of both organizations, who have constantly improved such cooperation since the agreement establishing it in 1965 and to welcome their efforts to improve the machinery for coordination and consultation between the United Nations and the OAU.

Ms. Leonce-Carryl (Saint Lucia): I am pleased to address the Assembly on agenda item 42, "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity", on behalf of the States members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), namely, Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, and my own country, Saint Lucia.

We wish to commend the Organization of African Unity (OAU) for the leadership it has provided in addressing many of the challenges facing the continent, particularly in the areas of peace and security and development. That approach is certainly what the founders of the United Nations envisaged when they set forth in the Charter the principles governing the activities of regional arrangements and setting the framework for cooperation between such bodies and the United Nations.

There can be no question that the Organization of African Unity has played the important role envisaged for a regional organization in the maintenance of international peace and security and the furtherance of the aims and objectives of the United Nations. It has done so consistent with the provisions of the Charter and General Assembly resolution 49/57.

At this year's commemoration of Africa Day, the Chairman of the OAU recalled the tremendous strides made by the OAU since its inception in 1963. Its leadership in the struggle against colonialism, racism and apartheid has benefited not only the peoples of Africa but, indeed, all mankind.

Today, the OAU approaches the issues of development and the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts with the commitment and the sense of purpose that ensured its success in earlier struggles.

CARICOM welcomes the report of the Secretary-General (A/51/386) outlining the wide-ranging cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU over the period in review. We are pleased that the dialogue has been maintained at the highest levels, and we welcome the implementation of mechanisms for institutional cooperation between the United Nations and the OAU.

We support the development and strengthening of mechanisms for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts, and we urge the full cooperation and support of the United Nations system and the international community for these important initiatives.

The situation in the Great Lakes region is of great concern to us all. We have welcomed the call for a conference on peace, security and stability in that region, an initiative in which the OAU plays a key role.

We support the effort to address the tremendous refugee problem and the rehabilitation needs in that region, and we encourage the international community to make every effort to secure a lasting solution to the humanitarian tragedy that has unfolded in that area.

We are very aware of the efforts of the African States and the OAU to seek adequate solutions to the problems of debt and resource flows to the region. We agree that the issue of development is of critical importance and must be addressed with a sense of urgency. In this context, we see the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s (UN-NADAF) as an initiative of vital importance that must be given the full support of the international community.

That initiative, which seeks to address the fundamental development concerns in Africa, must be given high priority on the United Nations agenda and should benefit from the ongoing programme of United Nations-OAU cooperation.

In the area of development, we also note with appreciation the cooperation between the Economic Commission for Africa and the OAU, which will further the goal of enhancing economic development in Africa.

The work of the United Nations Centre for Human Rights, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and other programmes and agencies in key social, economic and humanitarian initiatives outlined in the report are all of vital importance to efforts to improve the quality of life on the continent.

We urge the United Nations Secretariat and these agencies and programmes to deepen and strengthen their activities in Africa, and encourage them to continue their close cooperation with the Organization of African Unity

in order to enhance the prospects for progress in their missions in the region.

CARICOM will support continued collaboration between the United Nations and the OAU in these and other efforts to promote the goal of peace, security, and development in Africa, and will support the draft resolution contained in document A/51/L.19.

Mr. Wilmot (Ghana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Mr. Rantao (Botswana): I am pleased to address the General Assembly on the subject of cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU). This question was first considered by the General Assembly as far back as 1965 and has, in the course of time, assumed more importance. Despite all the good intentions and pronouncements of the international community, economic growth in OAU member States remains very low. Their terms of trade continue to worsen, and the debt burden continues unabated.

The African continent, despite the commendable progress it continues to make in the consolidation of freedom and democracy, is still saddled with numerous problems that African countries may not be able to resolve on their own.

My delegation is therefore gratified to note from the Secretary-General's report (A/51/386) of 20 September 1996 that the United Nations system is carrying out, in close cooperation with the OAU, a comprehensive range of activities, which reflects a progressive trend towards the achievement of the goal of socio-economic development on the continent.

The growing partnership between the United Nations and the OAU is a laudable development, which, we believe, will make a positive contribution to strengthening the institutional and operational capacity of the OAU in all fields.

Of particular interest to my delegation is the OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, which is still in its infancy and therefore still having teething troubles.

My delegation believes that a strengthened mechanism for conflict prevention, management and resolution is an essential condition if the OAU is to tackle effectively the problems that exist or may arise in Africa, such as the situations in the Great Lakes region, Somalia, Liberia, the Sudan and Angola.

The efforts of the OAU mechanism in the field of preventive diplomacy also needs the support and assistance of the international community for the development of an early warning system through which conflict situations could be more predictable and preventable. This could take the form of technical assistance and personnel training, the development of the capacity of the member States to participate in peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, as well as support for the OAU's efforts to manage and foster a more peaceful transition to democratic rule in Africa.

Peace and stability are essential conditions for the success of any economic development initiative. A great deal of resources are still being channelled towards conflict resolution and humanitarian assistance. This has resulted in the diversion of resources that could otherwise have been directed towards food security, the infrastructure and sustainable development.

Many OAU member States, like most developing countries, still lack adequate sources of information. My delegation therefore urges the United Nations system to strengthen the OAU's institutional and operational capacities in terms of research, information gathering, analysis and dissemination.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution A/51/L.19 will be taken at a later date to be announced.

Agenda item 26

Cooperation between the United Nations and the Economic Cooperation Organization

Report of the Secretary-General (A/51/265 and Add.1)

Draft resolution (A/51/L.7/Rev.1)

The Acting President: I now call on the representative of Turkmenistan to introduce draft resolution A/51/L.7/Rev.1.

Mrs. Ataeva (Turkmenistan) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, I should like sincerely to congratulate Mr. Razali Ismail on his election to the high office of President of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly and to express my confidence that the work of the session will be crowned with success under his leadership.

As the representative of the State chairing the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO), I consider it a great honour to address this forum on an agenda item that is of vital importance to my country, Turkmenistan, and other States members of the ECO.

The ECO is a regional group of States collectively pursuing the achievement of social and economic prosperity for its 10 members, located in a region with a territory of more than 7 million square kilometres and a population totalling over 350 million people. In this region, which possesses a great wealth of natural resources, the ECO is a primary forum for promoting economic and cultural cooperation among peoples and for guaranteeing infrastructural links between the newly independent Republics of the former Soviet Union in Central Asia and the Caucasus and the rest of the world through a network of road, sea and air routes passing through the neighbouring countries — Afghanistan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Turkey.

Following the expansion of the ECO's membership from three member States to 10 in November 1992, the Organization made serious efforts to draw up comprehensive and long-term plans to expand cooperation. In 1993, two major documents were adopted that defined the goals of the Organization up to the year 2000: the Quetta Plan of Action and the Istanbul Declaration. That same year in Almaty, the ECO considered and adopted a project for the development of the transportation sector, which is being implemented at present. In May 1996, the Fourth Summit Meeting of the Heads of State and Government of the member States of the ECO, held at Ashgabat, endorsed a strategy for economic cooperation, the implementation of which will begin next year. The Summit also approved a number of documents aimed at reorganizing and restructuring the ECO in order to adapt it to the new economic and political realities of the region and of the world as a whole. As a follow-up to the efforts undertaken at the Third Summit of the Organization, in Islamabad, to establish regional cooperation institutions, the Ashgabat Summit adopted decisions aimed at further restructuring the organization.

In this crucial period of its development, the ECO has been able to strengthen and expand its international authority, to a large extent assisted by better cooperation with international organizations. After the adoption by the General Assembly in 1993 of resolution 48/2, the ECO was granted observer status in the United Nations. Since then, the ECO has been consistently and closely cooperating with the United Nations and its specialized agencies in implementing its social and economic programmes. We have established cooperation and are carrying out joint projects with many United Nations organizations and agencies, including the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP). The ECO has organized three important joint conferences with UNFPA, four joint workshops with UNICEF and several useful activities with ESCAP. UNDP has proposed a project to provide assistance in the implementation of the ECO Plan on Drug Control and is also preparing a macroeconomic study that will be important for the States members of the ECO. This study will help us to more efficiently coordinate cooperation to attain social and economic prosperity for the peoples of the region.

Given the growing trend towards greater interregional cooperation, the ECO is holding active and regular consultations with Asian subregional organizations, carried out with the assistance and coordination of ESCAP. The details of this joint work between the ECO and United Nations agencies are reflected in the report of the Secretary-General (A/51/265 and Add.1), submitted to this session of the General Assembly under item 26 of the agenda. In recent years, cooperation between the ECO and agencies of the United Nations system has reached a qualitatively new level, requiring the elaboration of a comprehensive cooperation strategy. We view this task as the next step towards deepening our interaction.

The draft resolution before you, entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Economic Cooperation Organization", of which Turkmenistan is a sponsor, reflects the basic trends and goals for cooperation between our two organizations and will no doubt provide important impetus to further

interaction. I call upon all Member States to support the draft resolution and to adopt it by consensus.

In conclusion, I would like to express our sincere gratitude to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and through him, to the United Nations specialized agencies and programmes with which the ECO enjoys cooperation, as well as to their heads.

I wish to express the hope that our cooperation will develop dynamically, and that in the future it will include greater contact between our two secretariats. I wish the General Assembly every success in the work of this session.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/51/L.7/Rev.1. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/51/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted (resolution 51/21).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 26?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 159

Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion

Draft resolution (A/51/L.23)

The Acting President: I give the floor to the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to introduce draft resolution A/51/L.23.

Mr. Azwai (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly has had an opportunity, at a number of its previous sessions, to look into the question of the use by certain developed countries of coercive economic measures against developing countries in order to discourage such countries from taking certain sovereign decisions or to force them to adopt specific policies that do not conform to their choices and convictions.

The Assembly has adopted a number of resolutions that have reflected its grave concern over the harmful effects suffered by the economies of developing countries and their developmental efforts as a result of these coercive economic measures, and over the negative effects of these measures on international economic cooperation and on worldwide efforts to establish an open non-discriminatory trade system.

Through all these resolutions, the General Assembly appealed to the international community to take urgent and effective measures to put an end to the use of coercive measures against developing countries, and called on developed countries to refrain from exercising political coercion as a means of effecting changes in the economic and social systems or in the internal and external policies of other countries. The General Assembly also called on developed countries to refrain from threats to impose commercial and financial restrictions, blockades, embargoes, and other economic sanctions on developing countries, because such practices violate the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and international bilateral and multilateral commitments.

After the adoption of these resolutions, it was hoped that the developed countries would put a halt to coercive economic measures. But instead they persisted and even expanded the scope and magnitude of the measures, escalating them to the extent that the United States recently introduced an unprecedented innovation.

In 1996, the United States enacted United States legislation that punishes foreign non-United States companies which invest more than $40 million to develop petroleum resources in either the Jamahiriya or the Islamic Republic of Iran.

These laws, since their introduction as bills, have rightly caused a wave of international surprise and expressions of opposition and condemnation. That is because they run counter to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, violate the principles of international law and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, impede international efforts aimed at liberalizing world trade, and gravely harm the economies and development plans of developing countries. These negative effects have even affected the substantial interests of many developed countries. Moreover, the laws reflect extreme selfishness on the part of the United States Administration which, having safeguarded its economic interests following the Gulf War, wants to

deprive Western and other countries of the remaining important markets in the Middle East. It is not difficult to identify the obvious fallacies in the justification for those laws.

The source of surprise generated by these laws is the fact that they were enacted in a country whose international commitments require it to observe the rules of international law, and not to violate any of those commitments. But, regrettably, it seems that we need to recall that the laws enacted by the United States completely contradict the principle of the territoriality of laws, whose effects should not apply outside the territorial jurisdiction of a State. Nobody here objects to the right of a State to enact laws or to its right to subject its population, both nationals and foreigners, to those laws. However, the right of a State to legislate has certain limits, just like all its other rights. Thus a State may not enact legislation that breaches a rule of international law or any of its international obligations. The laws enacted by the United States breach the norms of international law and violate an international commitment.

The enactment of these laws, which could destroy development in a number of countries, is an attack against the right of States for their physical entity to be respected. That right requires other States not to obstruct the progress of a State or its economic development, whether by direct or indirect intervention, or prevent it from increasing its resources, and not to impede the implementation of its vital projects or hamper its trade by closing international markets to its products. It is not difficult to understand the magnitude of the damage that such a law would do to a country like mine, which is making intensive efforts to develop its resources, both human and material.

Negative reactions rejecting these laws have come from various parts of the world, including the League of Arab States, the European Union, China, Japan, Australia, Russia, Canada and European companies with interests in the Arab region. Even United States companies have denounced such laws, realizing that they could have negative effects on them and, consequently, on the United States people.

The following is an excerpt from *The Wall Street Journal* dated 25 November 1996:

> "Traditionally, the U.S. has used trade sanctions to bring pressure on 'rogue' states. Since 1941, America — either unilaterally or in concert with others — has invoked sanctions more than 70 times. Despite the popularity of this policy option, the success of sanctions has largely been limited. Frustrated with the ineffectiveness of direct sanctions, Congress is adding more fuel to the fire by providing the White House with yet another economic weapon — called a secondary boycott — that extends the reach of U.S law to overseas companies that do business with targeted countries. The possible use of this gambit — some would call it a squeeze play — has irked friends and provoked pointed talk of retaliation. The potential economic harm it could inflict on our trading relations may ultimately hurt U.S. business and its workers."

The article goes on to state:

> "NAFTA partners to the north and south regard such boycotts as interference with their sovereignty. Europeans view America's 'bullying' its allies as a way to deal with rogue regimes as myopic.
>
> "The U.S., we believe, should avoid using weapons like secondary boycotts to achieve foreign policy objectives. Several leading newspapers have also noted the dangers such boycotts can bring."

Such policies were referred to in the *Financial Times* of London on 12 July 1996 when it stated:

> "Other governments need to remind the U.S. forcefully of a fact that its own legislators appear to have overlooked: it is part of an integrated global economy, on which its own prosperity increasingly depends. ... If it persists in playing the lone cowboy, it will invite reprisals against its own commercial interests abroad. Ultimately, it will undermine the rules governing the conduct of international economic and trade relations. Those rules operate to the advantage of all countries. The U.S. is no exception."

The New York Times of 1 July 1996 stated that:

> "Even when deployed on behalf of an otherwise worthy cause, secondary boycotts offend the sovereignty of America's closest allies, invite retaliation and may violate international trade treaties. ... Today's trading patterns involve many countries and need to be applied internationally. But the way to achieve concerted action is by diplomatic persuasion, not by overreaching acts of Congress.

"Global leadership requires moral courage and vision. The United States can lead by example and deed; it need not resort to bullying its friends."

These were statements published in the British and United States press.

In its statement of 23 August 1996, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries expressed its concern at the enactment of the so-called D'Amato law against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The statement said, *inter alia*:

"The Movement expresses its conviction that the aforementioned legislation is contrary to international law and to the norms and principles governing peaceful and friendly relations among nations. The enactment of the Bill is a blatant violation of the inalienable sovereignty of all States, as it attempts to impose the United States law extraterritorially on the international community. The Non-Aligned Countries remain steadfast in their rejection of actions of this nature against any of its members as reiterated by the Heads of State or Government at the Eleventh Summit held in Cartagena, Colombia."

The general debate in the General Assembly has confirmed the international community's rejection of the laws enacted by the United States. Some heads of delegation have expressed their opinion on those laws in a very frank manner. These included the Prime Minister of Malaysia, who said in his statement before the General Assembly on 27 September 1996,

"Even as we are asked to submit to GATT rules and the WTO, we find one country blatantly undermining the WTO by enacting extraterritorial laws that must be submitted to by all nations and their companies on pain of excommunication." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 12th meeting, p. 9)*

Mr. Hervé de Charette, Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, offered the point of view of France and Europe on the United States law in clear terms. In his statement before the Assembly on 25 September 1996, he said that

"Since 1945, international trade has been a powerful growth factor, contributing to a large extent to the expansion of the industrialized economies and to the success of so-called emerging countries. But here too we must have rules of the game, acknowledged at the world level, so as to develop and regulate trade, ensure that it is fair and prevent unilateral conduct.

"I should like to mention here the dangers of unilateralism. Unilateralism: behind this technocratic word lurks the temptation to impose the law of the strongest at the expense of dialogue and negotiation.

"France and Europe cannot accept that one country, even if it is the most powerful, attempt to regulate world trade by itself by means of decisions that have extraterritorial scope. The World Trade Organization does not allow it, and no one should doubt the firmness of French and European reactions were such measures actually to be implemented." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 8th meeting, p. 21)*

Just as clear were the words of the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland on the same law in the memorandum attached to his statement before the General Assembly on 24 September 1996:

"The European Union is deeply concerned about the extraterritorial elements contained in the recent legislation adopted by the United States concerning Cuba, Iran and Libya. The European Union reaffirms its right and intention to react in defence of its interest against the possible extraterritorial effects of this legislation."

The United States has circulated a paper full of misconceptions to justify its request to delegations not to support the draft resolution submitted by the Jamahiriya under this item. The United States affirms that, with the D'Amato law, it aims to put pressure on the Jamahiriya to respond to Security Council resolutions, including the call on Libya to surrender the two Libyan citizens suspected of involvement in the bombing of the Pan Am flight for trial. The United States also maintains that the law will help to deprive both the Jamahiriya and Iran from a source of income which, it claims, could be used to finance international terrorism and obtain weapons of mass destruction.

It is well known that the Jamahiriya has never objected to the trial of the two persons suspected of involvement in the explosion of the Pan Am flight. I do not want to go into the details of this problem here, but

I would like to state, in brief, that the Jamahiriya has, from the beginning, taken steps for the trial of the two suspects, based on the provisions of the 1971 Montreal Convention. However, the United States and its partner, the United Kingdom, which are both parties to this Convention, have impeded the trial for lack of cooperation with the Jamahiriya. The Jamahiriya has proposed numerous initiatives to hold the trial, but the two partners have frustrated all these initiatives. Now, we have the initiative of the League of Arab States for the two suspects to be tried at the International Court of Justice at The Hague in accordance with Scottish law and by Scottish judges. The only impediment to the implementation of this initiative is the objection of the two partners. They should give the Security Council a chance to discuss the initiative of the League of Arab States to put an end to this problem and, in turn, the suffering of a whole people who have borne the brunt of the sanctions for five years. The dispute over the venue of the trial of two persons suspected of involvement in the Lockerbie incident — and I repeat "suspected" because it is not yet proven — should not be lengthened. Rather, the Council should put an end to the suffering of the victims' families, which has been prolonged by the persistence of their countries and the use of their tragedy for political purposes, aimed at bringing a country to its knees, even though it refuses to kneel.

As for the claim that the law aims to deprive the Jamahiriya of a source of income that might be used to finance terrorism, once again I do not want to go into the details of our position on terrorism and our various initiatives contained in United Nations resolutions. We would like to reaffirm that our hand is extended for cooperation in combating this phenomenon, since we have been its foremost victims. The persistent repetition of this accusation automatically and bluntly will not serve any useful purpose.

If the wild imagination of the United States has convinced it that there are Libyan efforts to manufacture weapons of mass destruction, and that by this law the United States wants to obstruct these efforts out of concern for the non-proliferation of these weapons, then we request that it ask the Security Council to establish a commission to inspect all countries of the region, including Israel. This would be acceptable provided that any kind of weapon of mass destruction found in any country be destroyed. The world would then be sure which country obtains weapons of mass destruction and which country encourages and supports it.

Further, the United States paper circulated to delegations here added another allegation, namely that Libya's conduct directly threatens the United States' national security and is thus a clear threat to the international community. This is an over-exaggeration in every way. Granted, the United States is a major Power which plays a big role on the international scene, but it is not the international community. So let us see who threatens the national security of the other.

We have no hostility towards the United States or its people. It is the other way round. We have not frozen United States assets. We have not prohibited any commercial dealings with the United States. But it did all of this to us in 1986. We did not use bombers to attack United States cities and never killed defenceless civilians. It is the United States that hit Tripoli and Benghazi and bombed them in 1986, killing defenceless civilians in their sleep in the dark of night. We hatch no plots against the United States and its leadership. But the United States does against Libya. We have not come to the United States' coasts with our fleets and our forces. It is the United States which does that. Which of us, then, jeopardizes the national security of the other, we or the United States? Is it our conduct that threatens international stability and should be changed?

Another misleading assertion in the United States document is that the new law adds flexibility to the implementation of United Nations policy. That may be true within the United States, but it greatly confuses the international community because it implies that whenever a member of that community wishes to trade with another member, it should first consult with the United States to find out exactly what can and cannot be done. Is that the flexibility that the United States document refers to? If the document is not referring to trade, what is it referring to? We are not alone in thinking that the United States document refers to free trade: that is the perception of the entire international community, of which we are a member. There is already creeping confusion in trade relations because of the measures that the European Union had to take to confront United States legislation against Cuba.

This is not the first time the United States has enacted laws that contradict the principles of international law. But this time the action is more serious, and greater in magnitude and scope. In January 1981, the United States Government imposed comprehensive sanctions against the Jamahiriya, froze Libyan assets, prohibited all commercial and financial dealings with Libya and

prevented Libyan students from pursuing scientific studies. It also enacted laws imposing coercive economic measures against Cuba and Iran. A quick review of United States relations with other countries shows that most have been subjected to similar coercive policies as a means of political and economic compulsion.

In introducing this item, the Jamahiriya is not trying to divert attention from any issue, as the United States document claims. The Jamahiriya is aware of all its international commitments, adheres to the rules of international law and eagerly supports the implementation of the principles and purposes of the United Nations. Libya is not in confrontation with the international community, as the United States document tries to depict. It is the United States itself which is in confrontation with the international community. It is the United States which has violated the law of nations by enacting an extraterritorial law and imposing sanctions on foreign companies and persons that, now and in the future, work and invest in the Jamahiriya, Iran and Cuba. The international community has unambiguously rejected those laws.

The Jamahiriya is not in confrontation with the international community, even with regard to the Lockerbie incident. It has met all the requirements of Security Council resolutions. The only thing remaining to be done is to try the two suspects in the manner I referred to earlier. Libya's highly flexible positions have received the support of the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and a majority of the members of the Security Council. The fact that the United States managed somehow to get the Security Council to adopt those resolutions does not mean that the Jamahiriya is in confrontation with the international community. That scenario is a common one here in these times.

Enactment of the law is a unilateral action taken by the United States in isolation from the international community. It is directed, in the first instance, against countries with vital interests in the Jamahiriya and Iran, and it damages the vital interests of any country that would like to enter those markets in the future. That confirms categorically that the United States acted alone in order to present the international community with a *fait accompli*. This belies its claim that it prefers multilateral action. If it really did, it would have listened to the universal voice of reason when the law was still a bill, and would have heeded the early warnings of the European Union.

The coercive economic measures and extraterritorial laws adopted by the United States of America are in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, the norms of international law, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the rules of the World Trade Organization. They gravely harm the economies of developing countries and the vital interests of many developed countries, and have been rejected by the entire international community. Those measures and laws should be rejected by the General Assembly in direct and clear terms in order to forestall the chaos and economic devastation that those measures and laws will cause throughout world.

We must tell the United States with one unhesitating voice that this is a grave mistake and it should be corrected. The United States does not have sovereignty over other States, and that the international community has not given it a mandate to regulate world trade unilaterally. That is exactly what the Jamahiriya wanted when it requested the inclusion of this additional item on the agenda of the General Assembly, and that is what is reflected in the draft resolution contained in document A/51/L.23.

The draft resolution has nothing to the do with the sanctions imposed by the Security Council on the Jamahiriya. Rather, it focuses on the unilateral laws enacted by a certain State imposing sanctions on other countries and their nationals. This is made clear in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which does not single out any State or incident, but rather calls for the repeal of such measures, regardless of whether the State that enacted them is developed or developing, large or small.

The draft resolution does not attempt to defend any special interest, but seeks rather to defend the interests of a large sector of developed and developing countries. It attempts to defend the general interests of the international community. It speaks of principles, not details. It aims to protect us against the turbulence and chaos that could soon be caused by extraterritorial laws enacted unilaterally to impose coercive economic measures. The draft resolution attempts to confront the unilateral decisions that have begun to jeopardize the international community in many areas. To deny that would be to deny facts and the provisions of the draft resolution before the Assembly.

The text before us is not a draft resolution for Libya. It is a draft resolution for the international community and must enjoy full support lest we find

ourselves saying, as in the fable, that we were devoured on the day the white bull was devoured.

Mr. Bohayevsky (Ukraine): As we all know well, the inadmissibility of the use or the encouragement of the use of economic or any other coercive measures inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations as a means of political and economic compulsion is enshrined in the basic documents of this Organization, primarily in the Charter, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and a number of resolutions of the General Assembly.

In spite of the fact that resort to unilateral measures of economic compulsion not sanctioned by the world community for the purpose of gaining political dividends has been repeatedly deplored in the highest international forums, including those held under United Nations auspices, we note with regret that this practice remains in the political arsenals of some States, which use it to interfere in the internal affairs of other States and, in certain situations, for so-called material support of direct territorial claims.

That is why our delegation strongly believes that this problem should not be treated as relating exclusively to the developing countries. It is similarly acute for the new sovereign States that are experiencing today a complicated and sometimes very painful period of achieving self-determination and establishing their own models of national development.

This process is accompanied by objective economic difficulties caused by the specifics of the transition to a market-based economy. It is quite obvious that during this period these countries are becoming particularly vulnerable to measures of external economic compulsion on the part of more economically powerful States, especially those with which the countries in transition have strong economic and political ties. In our view, the ideological basis and the source of such policies with regard to new independent States is the reluctance of certain political circles to reckon with the objective course of history and the realities of today.

On behalf of my delegation let me avail myself of this opportunity to emphasize once again that this policy has no prospects and endangers the peace and stability of the relevant countries and regions. We therefore call for the unconditional and complete exclusion of measures of economic compulsion from the arsenals of the foreign policy of all States, regardless of whether they are large or small. In this context, it is especially important that all States remain committed to the obligations they enter into under specific agreements at the multilateral, regional, subregional and bilateral levels.

Now more than ever — when new forms of international cooperation are emerging and when there is a marked increase in globalization and in the interrelation of economic activities, liberalization of trade, active cooperation in the field of science and technology, and the flow of finances and services — it is necessary to end the use of economic relations for the purpose of political and economic compulsion. And therefore there is an urgent need to create an effective mechanism within the United Nations system that would adequately address the emerging problems which so far have not been faced either by individual States or by the world community as a whole.

Unfortunately, the existing practice shows that the positive influence of international trade and economic relations on the prospects of peace and security cannot be taken as absolute, for we can recall many examples of confrontations, including military ones, between economically interdependent States. As is well known, external economic dependence has a critical level and limit beyond which States may begin to lose their sovereignty.

Under its mandate, the Economic and Social Council, which bears the main responsibility for the coordination of international cooperation in the social and economic spheres, has no way of effectively intervening in the new global problems of the world's economic development. Again, we are of the view that Article 65 of the United Nations Charter, on the need for close cooperation between the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council has not been fully realized. Therefore, what we need today is the establishment of an appropriate mechanism within the United Nations system that would protect the economic sovereignty of Member States.

In our opinion, the first step towards this goal, as we have had an opportunity to state earlier before this body, could be the implementation of the proposal to create a council for economic security which was made by the President of Ukraine, Leonid Kuchma, at the Special Commemorative Meeting of the General Assembly on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations. We invite all Member States to exchange views on this proposal, which could be a good starting point for elaborating an appropriate mechanism.

As we see it, such a council could play the role of "nerve centre", taking the most important decisions with regard to the provision of operational needs and undertaking complex consideration of issues related to the economic security of countries and even whole regions. In such a capacity, the economic security council — as the proposed body could be named — would contribute substantially to the observance of the fundamental principles of respect for national independence, non-interference in internal affairs, and the elimination for all time of the use of economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion.

The United Nations has made many efforts to establish a new economic order. Much still has to be done if we seek a really new economic order, which cannot be separated from the goal of strengthening the economic security of each Member State, and if we want to ensure the further implementation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I believe the initiative taken by the delegation of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to propose to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" is a timely one. It allows us to address the issue of unilateral extraterritorial measures in a comprehensive and objective fashion.

The impermissibility under international law of unilateral sanctions is uniformly recognized by the international community. The adoption of coercive economic measures lies only within the mandate of the United Nations in particular situations where there exists a threat to peace or a breach of peace. Moreover, several relevant principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations provide a solid basis for the Organization to offset the use of unilateral sanctions by individual States.

According to General Assembly resolutions, unilateral coercive measures violate the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of other States, as well as in the exercise of the sovereign rights of States. In this regard, both the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Interference in the Internal Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted on 21 December 1965, and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted on 12 December 1974, stipulate that

> "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights." *(resolution 3281 (XXIX), art. 32)*

The Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty goes on to say that such measures also cannot be used to "secure advantages of any kind" from another States *(resolution 2131 (XX), para. 2)*

Furthermore, the General Assembly has denounced on various occasions unilateral economic coercion as a means of achieving political goals. Resolutions entitled "Economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries", adopted at the forty-fourth and fiftieth sessions of the General Assembly, is a prominent example of a series of United Nations reactions to such unlawful actions.

The imposition of coercive economic measures and the approval of domestic legislation for the horizontal escalation of such actions with extraterritorial implications also contradicts established international trade law, including the regulations of the World Trade Organization.

The United States of America imposed various forms of economic coercive measures against 79 foreign countries between 1979 and 1992. This is a statistic which indicates that the United States resorts to such unilateral measures more than any other State by a wide margin. Such unilateral United States measures have recently taken on dangerous dimensions. The enactment by the United States of new laws which contravene the principle of the territoriality of national laws significantly affects the sovereignty of other States and the legitimate interests of companies and persons falling under their jurisdiction. Recent unilateral sanctions by the United States against third parties investing in or doing business with Cuba, Libya and Iran are the most prominent in this category.

A series of formal sanctions have been imposed or reimposed by the United States on the Islamic Republic of Iran in the 1980s and 1990s, including most of the sanctions that had been revoked under the declaration signed between the two countries in 1981. During this period, Iran's efforts to promote peace and security in the region and its endeavours to enhance economic and social

development at the national and regional levels invariably faced overt and covert United States sabotage. The United States does not cease its efforts to try to persuade others to adopt similar measures against Iran, mostly through concocting a number of baseless allegations to justify its imposition of unilateral actions.

Fortunately, the international community has demonstrated its responsibility and sobriety by standing firm in rejecting the extraterritorial application of domestic United States legislation. The European Union deemed the extraterritorial application of United States legislation to be without any basis in international law. At its 20 November 1996 meeting, the World Trade Organization's Dispute Settlement Body decided, at the request of the European Union, to establish a special panel of experts to examine the compatibility of recent United States acts against Cuba with the norms governing that Organization and with several provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

At their annual meetings in 1996, foreign ministers both of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the Group of 77 called for the immediate elimination of all forms of coercive economic measures with negative, extraterritorial impact on the development of developing countries and which undermine the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and the free flow of trade and investment. The recent ministerial meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference adopted similar positions.

It is also worth mentioning that the consideration of this crucial issue by all the recent major international conferences and summits is a manifest illustration of its multidimensional character, which adversely affects all countries and the world economy as a whole.

To conclude, while my delegation believes that the draft resolution before us (A/51/L.23) could be improved substantially, we call upon Member States to adopt it unanimously. In so doing they will demonstrate to the outside world the continued commitment and efforts of the international community, vis-à-vis the realization of the goals and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to say first how deeply grateful we are to the sisterly delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for having taking the initiative to include this important item on the agenda.

The increasing use of coercive economic measures as a means of economic and political compulsion has led to an increase of tension in international economic and political relations, which poses a threat to international peace. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations states that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. According to the Charter, the General Assembly must discharge certain essential duties, including the promotion of international economic cooperation, and cooperation in the social, cultural, educational and health fields. It must also promote respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms for the whole of mankind.

In the light of these responsibilities, the General Assembly must consider any measures taken which contravene these principles and study means to redress them. Experience has shown that coercive economic measures are an odious means which will never convince people to give up their inalienable right to make their own economic, political and social choices. However, this weapon has unfortunately proven to be effective. The results of this are the suffering of innocent civilians, the halt of economic development in the target country — and to a lesser extent among its international trading partners — and economic and political instability.

The use of this weapon is also a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. These include the sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the right of people to choose their own economic and political regimes, and the right to development and to participate in international economic relations on the basis of mutual interests.

These coercive economic measure, whether imposed unilaterally by a given State or through influencing multilateral institutions, are backed up by a policy which leads to nothing. I point out that States that resort to coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion are trying to find a way to legitimize their policies by having such measures imposed by multilateral international agencies. This is the case of Iraq. This is now the case of Cuba, as attempts are under way to impose a multilateral sanctions regime.

Furthermore, section 4 of the D'Amato law, entitled "Multilateral Regime", provides for the integration of coercive economic measures into multilateral systems.

Contradictory trends have been emerging at an increased rate in today's world. On the one hand, the international community and the absolute majority of States Members of this international Organization are trying to ensure the primacy of law and to build a world characterized by justice, prosperity and equality of rights. On the other hand, a minority, impelled by a desire for hegemony and a thirst for power, believe themselves above the law. This minority does not hesitate to use all possible means to serve their own interests. The majority must therefore tell the minority that this is not the right path. The draft resolution introduced by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is an attempt to do this.

Coercive economic measures imposed on Iraq have prevented our country from making a contribution to the Organization; as a result, we have lost our right to vote. Had this not been the case, we would have voted in favour of this draft resolution, entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion", which appears in document A/51/L.23.

Mr. Núñez Mosquera (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Cuba's position on unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries is widely known, as is the view of the international community, as expressed in numerous international instruments and resolutions of the General Assembly.

Although it has been said euphemistically that the cold war is now over, we are still living amid an international order in which the major economic and political Power, taking advantage of its predominant position, is continuing unilaterally to apply coercive economic measures against developing countries — not because of the danger these countries pose to the national security of that Power, as is usually alleged, but because of its manifest intent to impose upon those countries certain of its foreign policy objectives.

Although this fact is well known, it must be reiterated: the imposition of these kinds of measures by one country against another is a clear violation of international law and seriously damages the principles of sovereign equality, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Moreover, the unilateral application of these measures contravenes the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and other international instruments governing relations among States, such as the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

In both Declarations, the international community recognized that no State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State, and that no State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights or to secure from it advantages of any kind.

The application of the kind of measures referred to in the draft resolution introduced today by the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya not only represents an attack on the identity of the State concerned and on its political, economic and cultural elements, but also affects other sensitive areas such as the ability of the peoples suffering from those unilateral policies fully to enjoy their human rights.

In this connection, the Commission on Human Rights itself has determined that the application of unilateral coercive economic measures has a negative impact on social and humanitarian indicators in developing countries, and prevents the peoples subjected to such measures from fully enjoying their rights.

Moreover, the Commission on Human Rights Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development described the application of coercive measures as a stumbling block to the application of the right to development.

Furthermore, pursuant to resolution 1994/47 of the Commission on Human Rights, the Secretary-General informed that body, in his report contained in document E/CN.4/1995/43, that application of unilateral coercive measures is incompatible with the principle of international cooperation, has an adverse impact on the economies of developing countries suffering under the measures and constitutes a serious violation of the human rights of the individuals, groups and peoples affected.

General Assembly resolutions 44/215, 46/210, 48/168 and 50/96, on economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries, also show that most States Members of the United Nations reject the application of unilateral measures.

It is therefore the view of the delegation of Cuba that States Members of the United Nations should be deeply concerned at the fact that one of them persists in the unilateral application of such measures, thereby contravening, deliberately and repeatedly, the aforementioned international principles, norms and instruments.

This concern should be all the greater in view of what appears to be a new set of coercive economic measures, applied by that same Member State and directed against not only the political and economic stability of the country affected but also against the sovereignty of third States.

The United States' promulgation of laws such as the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996, whose extraterritoriality has already elicited broad international reaction, as was seen in the Assembly's general debate on this issue, seems to be ushering in an era in which attempts are being made to rule the world from the Capitol in Washington.

Passage of the so-called D'Amato-Kennedy Act, which would impose sanctions on foreign investors in Iraq and Libya, regardless of their nationality or of the jurisdiction of the companies they may work for, for the purpose of preventing those countries from continuing to develop their oil industry, is bereft of any moral or legal justification, both in respect of its political motivations and of the means decided upon to enforce this whim of the United States Congress.

On the threshold of the new millennium, the emergence of unilateral coercive measures of an extraterritorial nature, entails yet another serious danger in the context of our increasingly interdependent world. The risks posed by a country — no matter how powerful it may be — in unilaterally reserving the right to undermine the discipline of multilateral trade, which was recently brought about with the completion of the Uruguay Round and the emergence of the World Trade Organization, for reasons totally alien to trade issues, must be confronted appropriately and resisted by the international community. The impact of those policies on the lives of the more vulnerable peoples and sectors of the populations in the countries suffering from the policies must not be overlooked and ignored by this Organization.

For all of these reasons, Cuba will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/51/L.23.

The Acting President: We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/51/L.23.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting. May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Hoey (Ireland): The European Union wishes to take this opportunity to reiterate its rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis. We have also rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. We stress that international coercive measures can be imposed on States only by, and under the authority of, the Security Council, in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

In this regard, we wish to mention the legislation that provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.

The European Union reaffirms its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures that appear to contravene international law. The European Union must, however, make a firm and unmistakable distinction between measures imposed unilaterally by individual States and those that are undertaken with the full authority of the Security Council, and in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. The European Union has accordingly concluded that it is unable to support the draft text and will abstain in the vote that is about to be taken.

Mr. Çelem (Turkey): The vote to be cast by Turkey on draft resolution A/51/L.23 does not relate in any way to any position or policy adopted or pursued by the country presenting it. Our vote should not be construed as expressing any approval or endorsement of such a position or policy of the country submitting the draft resolution. Turkey is basing its vote only on its opposition to the practice of extraterritoriality — in other words, any practice that extends the application of a country's legislation outside its jurisdiction. The application of extraterritorial measures not only runs counter to international law but also has a negative

impact on the economic interests of third countries and on the free flow of international trade.

In the view of my delegation, coercive economic measures can be imposed only by the United Nations in conformity with its Charter. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution before us simply reflects these considerations.

Mr. Gnehm (United States of America): The Government of Libya, which for years has victimized others with its financial and material support for international terrorism, now comes before the General Assembly seeking to portray itself as a victim of international sanctions. Clearly, its aim is to decrease the pressure brought to bear upon it by the community of nations for its unacceptable behaviour. We need to keep this broader context in mind as we consider Libya's draft resolution A/51/L.23 on "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion".

Libya would have United Nations Member States believe that this draft resolution is about free trade and the right of States to choose their own models of economic development. It is not. It is aimed at distracting attention from Libya's obstinate refusal to comply with its obligations under Security Council resolutions 731 (1992), 748 (1992) and 883 (1993). These resolutions were imposed because of Libya's involvement in two terrorist bombings of civilian aircraft — Pan Am flight 103 and UTA flight 772 — and its continued support for international terrorism.

By introducing this draft resolution, Libya seeks to break out of the international isolation imposed by the world community and to lend some legitimacy to its campaign to end terrorism-related sanctions, including those imposed by the Security Council. These sanctions, most recently reviewed this month, have been left in place without change through 14 consecutive reviews. Libya must not be encouraged to believe that anything less than full compliance with Security Council resolutions can end its confrontation with the international community.

We believe it would be wrong for the General Assembly to reward Libya's continuing defiance of the United Nations by supporting this draft resolution. For that reason, the United States will be voting against the draft resolution, and we urge others to do the same.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/51/L.23.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, San Marino, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/51/L.23 was adopted by 56 votes to 4, with 76 abstentions (resolution 51/22).

The Acting President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote. I would remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Ms. Hamilton (Australia): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/51/L.23 because the draft resolution fails to draw a clear distinction between measures imposed unilaterally by individual States and those measures that are undertaken pursuant to resolutions of the Security Council under the United Nations Charter.

Australia has, in this and other forums, made clear its opposition to national legislation that seeks to impose extraterritorial sanctions, determined unilaterally, on companies and individuals of third countries.

Mr. Powles (New Zealand): New Zealand takes this opportunity to reiterate its long-standing opposition to the application of national legislation on an extraterritorial basis. We regard as completely unacceptable and in violation of international legal principles any attempts by a country to restrict the freedom of companies from a third country to trade with any other State or to invest in another State. New Zealand has already made its position on this issue clear in the General Assembly during this session.

That said, we cannot support any attempt by a country to challenge in the General Assembly sanctions that have been imposed on it under the Charter of the Organization. As measures imposed by the Security Council, these sanctions enjoy full legitimacy and require the support of the membership of the Organization. This distinguishes them clearly from the unilateral, extraterritorial measures just mentioned.

The draft resolution does not make a sufficiently clear distinction between these two concepts. For this reason, New Zealand could not support the draft resolution and therefore abstained in the voting that has just taken place.

Mr. Jansen (Canada): Canada has abstained in the voting on the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly. Canada has always taken a vigorous stand against measures with extraterritorial effect that seek to constrain the freedom of investment and trade of third countries. While the resolution we have just considered calls for the repeal of unilateral, extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on other States, it fails to make clear the essential distinction between those measures undertaken with the full authority of the Security Council and in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, and those imposed unilaterally by individual States. As a result, we were not able to lend our support to this text.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): My delegation has opted to abstain, and we want to explain our reason for abstention. This does not mean that we agree that any State has a right to coerce another to achieve its purposes. But in this context, we have opted to live by our policy.

The Kingdom of Swaziland believes in the policy of goodwill, and, accordingly, we shall stand by that policy. But if a younger brother is being hit by another brother, and he seeks refuge with his elder brother, that does not mean that the elder brother has a right to kick the buttocks of the younger brother. And scripturally, we believe that blessed are those who are betrayed when two people are at war.

We in Swaziland believe that whenever certain parties have a contentious issue, we must open our house and listen to both sides and arbitrate. Hence, today we have felt that we should abstain because we are looking for a way in which the parties that may be affected here can eventually live like brothers and like Members of the United Nations. Otherwise, our abstention means no condonation, but it means that we should sit down and talk and become friends and Members of the United Nations.

Mr. De Rojas (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We voted in favour of this resolution because we agree with the main elements it contains.

However, we would have liked to see included in the operative part of the resolution a reference similar to the one in the preambular part relating to the need to promote the development of friendly relations among nations and cooperation in resolving economic and social problems.

We believe that operative paragraph 1 can be understood only in the context of States' full compliance with the commitments they have entered into under the Charter of the United Nations, international law, democratic principles and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Hajayandi (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be very brief. I have asked to speak to

express loudly and clearly my delegation's reasons for voting in favour of this resolution.

First, Burundi is in principle against any measure that unjustly affects the population of any State under whatever pretext. Secondly, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to remind the international community that my country is suffering from an inhuman, illegal and unjust economic blockade imposed by the neighbouring States under a pretext involving my country's domestic policies — a question that has already become nugatory.

My country believes that it has no lessons in morality or democracy to teach any other State. Like many others, we are involved in trying to find political and democratic stability, and sabotaging us economically will not help us achieve the noble goals of lasting peace and security.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 159?

It was so decided.

Programme of work

The Acting President: I should like to make an announcement concerning agenda item 21, entitled "Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance".

I should like to inform members that, in view of the number of draft resolutions expected under agenda item 21 and the possible need to go through the consultation process with a view to reaching consensus, the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under agenda item 21 will be Tuesday, 3 December 1996.

I should also like to remind representatives that, should a draft resolution have programme budget implications, additional time will be needed for the preparation of a statement of the programme budget implications by the Secretary-General. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee will need adequate time to review the programme budget implications of the draft resolution before the latter can be acted on by the Assembly.

I therefore urge members intending to submit draft resolutions under agenda item 21 but that have not yet done so to submit them as soon as possible, and, in any case, not later than the deadline of 3 December 1996.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.